DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 742 TM 014 611

AUTHOR Lundstrom, Francesca; Politiek-Haim, Ytje
TITLE Continuing Projects.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Champaign. Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Inst.
PUB DATE 13 Mar 90
NOTE 43p.; Appendixes 2 and 3 contain "filled" type, which may film poorly.
AVAILABLE FROM Transition Institute, 1310 Sixth Street, 110 Education Building, Champaign, IL 61820.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Demonstration Programs; Disabilities; Educational Finance; *Federal Programs; Postsecondary Education; *Predictor Variables; Program Length; *Program Termination; Secondary Education; Student Placement; *Transitional Programs; Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS *Program Continuation

ABSTRACT

Model demonstration projects have developed and implemented a wide range of services to facilitate the transition of youth with handicapping conditions from school to work or to postsecondary educational settings. Factors pivotal to the continuation of such projects after federal funding ceased were studied. Data on 58 sample projects were collected from the files of the Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute at the University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign). Additional information was obtained through a telephone survey. Twelve variables, accounting for 72.4% of the variance, were selected. The best predictor of continuation was that projects had engaged in high levels of replication and dissemination. The greater the number of "others" trained (Variable 2) and teachers trained (Variable 11), the less likely the program was to continue. The third best predictor of program continuation was that granting of a no-cost extension predicted project failure. Development of a newly conceived and innovative transition program predicted success, as did having a stable and dedicated group of personnel. Findings indicate which goals of federal funding are most likely to succeed. A table lists the variables in ranked order. A demographic description of the projects, record sheets, the questionnaire, and the coding for the data set are appended. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

FRANCESCA LUNDSTRÖM

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED318742

Continuing Projects

Francesca Lundström

and

Ytje Politiek-Haim

Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

13 March, 1990

TM 014611

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Continuing Projects

To enable implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act, the United States Congress in 1984 authorized $6.6 million annually (reviewed on a 2-3 yearly basis) in grants and contracts intended to strengthen and coordinate education, training, and related services for youth in the process of transition from school to work or post-secondary educational settings.

The bulk of this discretionary money was used to fund more than 100 model demonstration projects in either transition or post-secondary education across the United States. The aim of the grant program was to expand transition services for youth with disabilities. The rationale was to demonstrate the effectiveness of newly conceived transition/post-secondary education models which could be replicated either in whole or part in other communities. The projects were funded for 12 to 36 months, with an average grant period of 28 months. The mean annual award level was $100,000. Each of the projects had as part of its proposal a commitment to evaluation, dissemination, and replication. Funding recipients included institutions of higher education, state education agencies, local education agencies, and not-for-profit agencies.

Since 1984, 180 model demonstration projects have developed and implemented a wide range of service delivery models, focused on facilitating the transition to work of youth with handicapping conditions. Projects can be divided into four main categories: (a) educational (providing services that enable a young person with disabilities to acquire more competency in such life skills

as handling money, shopping, personal hygiene, etc., or for the less severely disabled, to attend college); (b) work-related (providing services to enable a young person with disabilities to secure employment); (c) interagency cooperation (setting up mechanisms to ensure that relevant school, rehabilitation, community, and other agencies develop cooperative agreements to eliminate gaps and redundancies in helping young persons with disabilities in transition programs within specific communities); and (d) other (diverse types of projects which cannot be easily categorized).

Project services are provided in diverse settings, including major metropolitan areas, suburbs, small towns, and rural areas. In addition, some models are designed to provide county-, state-, or nationwide services.

Of the youths being served by projects, over one-half have a learning disability, and approximately 20% have either a developmental disability or a diagnosis of mental retardation. To date, 18,877 persons with diverse disabilities have been served by model demonstration projects. The majority of such projects also offer related service components to parents, teachers, agency personnel, business/industry personnel, and other service providers.

Considerable expertise, manpower, time, and resources--not to mention taxpayers' money--have been expended to initiate and maintain projects. An enormous amount of knowledge and experience must be acquired by project personnel immediately before and during the funding period. It would therefore seem a waste of resources and knowledge if projects should expire

without leaving some record of the insights gained by project personnel. Of course, some projects survive to a greater or lesser degree when funding has ceased; these must be regarded as having some special ingredient(s) not possessed by the others.

Little is presently known about what happens to projects when funding ceases or why some projects continue while others do not. Our research redresses this lacuna by determining which characteristics are pivotal in the continuation of projects after federal funding has expired. The thrust of our inquiry entails the construction of a data matrix of variables describing projects' characteristics.

By providing information on which factors were pivotal in project continuation, this research seeks to offer crucial insights to funding agencies, enabling them to be more discerning in selecting projects to fund. From another perspective, the information gained by this research will help initiators of model projects to examine critically the factors they consider for inclusion in projects, in light of what has been shown to be effective.

Tatsuoka (1970, p. 1) noted, "When two or more groups are compared in terms of many variables it is of interest not only to see if they differ significantly from one another but, if they do differ, also to understand the nature of their differences" (see also Klecka, 1980). This type of comparison will be the object of our quantitative data analysis.

The Sample

Sixty projects were screened initially for inclusion in the data set. Criteria for selection were that projects (a) had been federally funded, (b) had been receiving technical assistance from the Transition Institute at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and (c) that their federal funding had ceased prior to 1988. Two projects had to be eliminated from the sample because they had not furnished sufficient information and their personnel were unavailable to answer the telephone questionnaire, thus leaving a total of 58 projects in the sample. Appendix 1 contains a demographic description of the projects.

The Data

Data collection was performed in two stages. In Stage One, a coding scheme was devised for extracting data from the Institute's files on expired projects and numerically coding the textual information contained therein. These data were collected from (a) the Transition Institute's Project Profiles data base, (b) Final Reports from projects, (c) other relevant information contained in the project files, and (d) a list of the actual funding paid to projects by the Federal Government, provided by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS). The data were entered on computerized data files. All missing or unclear information was noted. (See Appendix 2 for a copy of the record of missing data form.)

In Stage Two a telephone questionnaire (Appendix 3), developed for use with expired projects, was designed to elicit and check information on the most commonly missing or unclear

data encountered in Stage One. The questionnaire was initially mailed to the 11 projects which expired in 1988-89 (and not part of our sample) to test it for clarity and ease of use. Respondents were requested to complete and critique the questionnaire. Seven projects complied, and we amended the questionnaire in the light of their comments. Telephone interviews were then initiated with the projects in the target group. The respondents were also asked to furnish information particular to their project which had been noted as missing in the abovementioned missing data form and not covered by the questionnaire. This strategy yielded a data matrix which was both verified from several sources and free of missing data.

Method

The variables included in the data set are described in detail in Appendix 4. Some of the variables collected were not suitable for inclusion in the data analysis for several reasons: (a) the variables quantifying the amount of time spent in evaluation by different personnel levels (TMEVL, MMTMEVL, FLTIMEVL) and the number of students impacted indirectly by the project (IMPACT) were difficult for respondents to estimate, and many admitted they were guessing; (b) such variables as (HOWEVAL--type of evaluation plan) were questions inherited from a previous Institute questionnaire, and respondents, when asked this question (as part of the missing information component of the telephone interview), claimed they did not understand what it meant and could only guess at the answer. Some variables were redundant (e.g., METHOD--method employed by project, PURPOSE--

purpose of the project), or were irrelevant to the analysis (e.g., PRODUCT--types of products produced).

The dependent variable (ordinal level of measurement) was constructed from projects' varying levels of continuation. There were 83 potential "independent" variables in the multiple regression model, of which 15 were interval, 23 ordinal, and 45 nominal.

Data Analysis

Stepwise multiple regression was performed on the data set. The following procedure was adopted:

1. Using "Continue" (Ordinal) as the dependent variable, all variables deemed suitable for this type of analysis and an additive constant were included in stepwise multiple regression.
2. For cross-validation the sample was split into two randomly selected halves.
3. Step 1 was performed separately on both sub-samples.
4. The model of variables selected for sub-sample A was run and on sub-sample B and vice versa. The variance accounted for in both instances was noted.

Results

Twelve variables accounting for 72.4% of the variance are displayed in Table 1, in the order selected by stepwise multiple regression, together with an interpretation, beta weight, and nominal level of significance.

Cross-Validation

Some shrinkage is expected in cross-validation, and this

study was no exception. The variances accounted for in applying model from sub-sample A to the cases in sub-sample B and vice versa were respectively 42% and 57%.

Discussion of Findings

We noted earlier that 12 variables accounted for 72.4% of the variance. Considering the variables, generally in decreasing order of importance (all ordinal numbers in this discussion of variables refer to the order given in Table 1), we first note that the best predictor of continuation after cessation of federal funding was whether projects had engaged in high levels of replication and dissemination. It is not surprising that projects which have been replicated (in full or part) and/or have engaged in high levels of dissemination will to function continue after federal funding has ceased, as these activities by their very nature are indicative of success.

Insert Table 1 about here

Two predictors are associated with training of individuals as a related service component. The first concerns the training of "others", and Variable 11 with the training of teachers. That is, the greater the number of teachers and "others" projects train as related service components predicts failure to continue after the cessation of federal funding, indicating that indiscriminate (and probably minimal) training of large numbers of individuals is not a strategy to be encouraged. (As many as 650 teachers and 1,000 "others" were claimed to have been trained by individual projects.)

The third best predictor was that the granting of a no-cost

extension is indicative of projects' failure. A possible explanation may be that such projects encountered adversities which remained unresolved during the actual funding period. This finding may indicate that projects should be monitored regularly for signs of difficulties (e.g., turnover in personnel, or attempting to train too many individuals as related service components). Monitoring by an external organization and providing such resources as technical assistance should be implemented, to help projects quickly overcome problems.

Predictor Variable 4 reveals that the development of a newly conceived, innovative transition program predicts success. This result indicates the importance of innovation and originality in program design to inspire dissemination and replication.

It is not unexpected that stability of personnel (Variable 5) is indicative of project continuation. New and innovative programs require permanence, leadership, and dedication from staff at all levels in order to succeed. This finding may be relevant to the monitoring procedure suggested above as one indication of a floundering project.

Variable 6 and 12 indicate at which level of education transition projects are more likely to continue. That is, projects which are involved with a community education/ rehabilitation facility (Variable 6) do not continue, whereas those involved with a public secondary school (Variable 12) do, indicating that reaching students only in the final stages of their academic preparation may be a less successful strategy than are earlier interventions while students are attending high

school.

Two findings seem to be at variance: (a) if the project purpose is educational it will be more likely to continue (Variable 7), but (b) if education and training are stated objectives the project will be less likely to continue (Variable 10). When a project's stated purpose is educational, then education is its primary goal and function. On the other hand, a stated objective such as training and education is just one of ten objectives which can be checked by a project as incidental to its main purpose. (See p. 2 of Appendix 4.) Stated objectives should be regarded as aspirations to be striven for as opposed to purposes which are fundamental to the whole operation of the project. These two findings together imply that projects whose primary purpose is educational (as opposed to the other three possible purposes) are likely to continue, whereas projects which only aspire to education and training as service components do not.

The eighth predictor showed that serving individuals who are severely mentally handicapped portends continuation, whereas serving individuals who have communication disorders/speech impairment (Variable 9) does not. This result may reflect the differing specializations required to serve individuals in the two groups; thus, interventions different from those in general-purpose transition projects are required for individuals with communication disorders and speech impairments.

Conclusions

A project which will survive after the cessation of federal funding will be one deeply committed to dissemination and replication, engaged in training a select core of individuals to high levels of competency, involved in innovative program development in the area of education--especially in the area of service to individuals with severe mental retardation--and will have a stable, dedicated group of personnel.

A project is less likely to survive after federal funding has ceased will be one having little or no dissemination and replication component, seeking to train large, heterogeneous groups of individuals, having programs in community education/ rehabilitation facilities, seeking to serve individuals with communication disorders/speech impairments, and having personnel likely to leave in the early stages of the project.

These findings demonstrate which goals of federal funding to finance newly conceived demonstration projects in transition can be replicated either in whole or part in other communities across the United States and are effective when operating in the abovementioned settings. The findings also reveal that transition model programs at the post-secondary level are less effective than are earlier interventions in fulfilling these goals.

References

Klecka, W. R. (1980). Discriminant analysis. Sage University paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, No. 19. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tatsuoka, M. M. (1970). Discriminant analysis. Selected topics in advanced statistics: An elementary approach. No. 6. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Table 1

The Variables that Predict Continuation after Cessation of Federal Funding in Decreasing Order of Importance.

Variable	Interpretation	Coefficient	p(Two-Tailed)
1. DISEMLEV:	The greater the amount of replication and/or dissemination of information about a project the more likely it is to continue.	0.262	0.078
2. OTHRAIN:	If "others" are trained as a related service component the less likely a project will continue.	-0.004	0.001
3. EXTEND:	A project which is granted a "no-cost extension" is less likely to continue.	-1.538	0.002
4. PROGDEV:	When program development is a stated project objective continuation is more likely.	1.139	0.000
5. PERSCHA:	The fewer the personnel changes which occur during the life of a project, the greater the possibility of the project continuing after cessation of federal funding.	0.0209	0.102
6. EDCOMED:	If a community education/rehabilitation facility is involved in a project it is less likely to continue.	-1.085	0.005
7. PURED:	If the stated purpose of a project is educational the more likely it will continue.	1.621	0.000
8. SMR:	If individuals who are severely mentally handicapped were part of the target population of a project it is more likely to continue.	1.402	0.000

Table 1 (continued)

Variable	Interpretation	Coefficient	p(Two-Tailed)
9. COMMDIS:	If individuals who have a communication disorder/speech impairment are part of the target population of a project it is less likely to continue.	-1.225	0.006
10. TRAINED:	If training and education is a stated objective it is less likely to continue.	-0.775	0.006
11. TEATRAIN:	The greater the number of teachers trained as a related service component by a project, the less likely it will continue after the cessation of federal funding.	-0.005	0.009
12. EDPUBSCH:	If a public school is one of the educational agencies involved in a project the more likely it is to continue.	0.805	0.024

Appendix 1

DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTS IN CONTINUING PROJECTS

DATA SET

N=58

Type of Grantee:

State agency	22
City or county government	4
Research institute	1
Profit making agency	1
Non-profit making agency	6
Community education/rehabilitation facility	1
JTPA service delivery	1
University oof four-year college	12
Community or junior college	2
Local education agency	5
Private secondary school	1
Public secondary school	2
Other	1

Geographic Area Served:

Nationwide	2
Region of nation (more than one state)	2
State	19
Region within a state (more than one county)	10
County	11
Part of a county	14

Funding	$264,665	$46,658 - $654,387
Length of funding period	2 years	1 - 3 years
Number of individuals served	136	0 - 1,000

Appendix 1 (continued)

Levels of Continuation:

Continued in situ in full by means of other funding	33
All major components continued but but split up and being continued by other agencies	3
More than 75% of project components continued	3
More than 50% of project components continued	11
More than 25% of project components continued	3
Less than 25% of project components continued	3
No project components continued continued	2

Appendix 2: Record of Missing Data

PROJECT #:_____

CONTACT PERSON:_____

TELEPHONE NUMBER:_____

VARIABLE	COLUMN NUMBER	MISSING DATA

APPENDIX 3

Competition # _____
TI # _____

CONTINUING PROJECTS QUESTIONNAIRE
(All the questions relate to the time when the project was federally funded.)

First, I would like to ask you about the background of the project.

1. How much Federal funding did the project receive in total? $_____

2. How much funding from other sources did the project receive?

$_____

3. Was the purpose of the project: (Mark each answer that applies)

educational	____ 1
employment	____ 2
an interagency cooperative effort	____ 3
other (please specify)	____ 4

_____

_____

4. Was the method used:

an extension of existing services	____ 1
a standardization of an existing process	____ 2
a development of a new model of service	____ 3
a building of interagency partnerships	____ 4
an implementation of a model program	____ 5
the creation of a new agency	____ 6
another (please specify)	____ 7

_____

_____

Next, I would like to find out more about the personnel involved.

5. How many people were involved in top-level management (for example, the principal investigator, project director, etc.)?

____

6. How much of their professional time did the top-level managers spend on your project?

full time	____ 1
more than 75%, but less than full time	____ 2
more than 50%, but less than 75%	____ 3
more than 25%, but less than 50%	____ 4
more than 10%, but less than 25%	____ 5
less than 10%	____ 6

7. What was the educational level of each of the top-level managers?

Ph.D.	____ 1
Master's	____ 2
B.A.	____ 3
Other (please specify)	____ 4

_____

_____

8. How many middle managers were involved with your project (for example consultants, LEA personnel, vocational specialists, etc.)?

____

9. How much of their professional time did middle managers spend on your project?

full time	____ 1
more than 75%, but less than full time	____ 2
more than 50%, but less than 75%	____ 3
more than 25%, but less than 50%	____ 4
more than 10%, but less than 25%	____ 5
less than 10%	____ 6

10. What was the educational level of the middle managers?

Ph.D.	____ 1
Master's	____ 2
B.A.	____ 3
Other (please specify)	____ 4

_____

_____

11. How many staff members (excluding those mentioned above) worked directly with clients?

____

12. Did they work

full time	____ 1
more than 75%, but less than full time	____ 2
more than 50%, but less than 75%	____ 3
more than 25%, but less than 50%	____ 4
more than 10%, but less than 25%	____ 5
less than 10%	____ 6

13. How many personnel changes occurred among:

top-level managers	____ 1
middle managers	____ 2
staff members (excluding support staff)	____ 3
no changes at all	____ 0

I shall now be asking questions related to the students involved.

14. How many students actually participated in your project?

____

15. How many students were affected indirectly by some sort of contact with your project?

____

16. What were the primary disabilities of the target students?

autism or emotional disorder	____ 1
communication disorder or speech impairment	____ 2
hearing impairment or visual impairment	____ 3
learning disability	____ 4
severe mental retardation	____ 5
moderate mental retardation	____ 6
mild mental retardation	____ 7
physical disability	____ 8
other forms of disability (please specify)	____ 9

_____

_____

The next few questions relate to the evaluation process.

17. Who was responsible for evaluating your project?

project personnel only	____ 1
external evaluator only	____ 2
project personnel and external evaluator	____ 3
other (please specify)	____ 4

_____

_____

18. How many hours per week did top-level managers spend on evaluation?

____

19. How many hours per week did middle managers spend on evaluation?

____

20. How many hours per week did other staff members spend on evaluation?

____

21. How often did evaluations take place (Mark the highest answer that applies)

ongoing/daily	____ 7
less than monthly	____ 6
monthly	____ 5
quarterly	____ 4
half-yearly	____ 3
yearly	____ 2
at the end of the project	____ 1

Now I would like to ask you some questions relating to problems you may have encountered during the course of the project.

22. Had your project problems with cooperating agencies such as: (Mark each answer that applies)

gaining initial support	____ 1
maintaining support during funding period	____ 2
other problems (please specify)	____ 3

_____

_____

no problems/not applicable	____ 0

23. Had your project any of the following problems with clients?

too many clients	____ 1
schools did not refer pupils	____ 2
schools referred inappropriate pupils	____ 3
difficulties with client follow-up	____ 4
other (please specify)	____ 5

_____

_____

no problems/not applicable	____ 0

25. Had your project any of the following problems with staff?

staff "burnout" (that is staff becoming tired, losing enthusiasm because of the overwhelming nature of their work) ____ 1

high turnover ____ 2

sudden resignation ____ 3

other problems (please specify) ____ 4

_____

_____

no problems/not applicable ____ 0

26. Had your project any of the following problems with employers?

too few/inappropriate jobs ____ 1

difficulties in placing clients ____ 2

clients being laid off ____ 3

other (please specify) ____ 4

_____

_____

no problems/not applicable ____ 0

Finally, I would like to ask you about the dissemination and continuation of the project.

27. During its period of federal funding was/were your project (Mark the <u>highest</u> answer that applies)

replicated in whole or in part by another organization ____ 4

dissemination seminars/site visits given ____ 3

dissemination seminars/presentations off-site given ____ 2

dissemination conducted through any or all of the following: films, videos, publications, and manuals ____ 1

no attempt at dissemination made ____ 0

28. Has your project (Mark the highest answer that applies)

been continued in full by means of other funding	____ 6
had all major components continued but split up and continued by other agencies	____ 5
had more than 75% of project components continued	____ 4
had more than 50%, but less than 75% of project components continued	____ 3
had more than 25%, but less than 50% of project components continued	____ 2
had less than 25% of project components continued	____ 1
had no project components continued	____ 0

WE APPRECIATE ANY COMMENTS OR CRITICISMS YOU MAY HAVE ABOUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!

APPENDIX 4

ORIGINAL CODING FOR CONTINUING PROJECTS DATA SET

Column Number	Variable Name	Variable Description	Code	Level of Measurement
Record #1				
0-3	ID	Identity of Project	Transition Institute # (not for data analysis).	
4	TIME	Number of years project was funded	Actual number	Interval
5-10	REQFEAMT	Total amount of Federal funding requested	Dollar amount	Ratio[2]
11-16	FAMOUNT	Total amount of Federal funding received	Dollar amount	Ratio[2]
17-22	OAMTREQ	Total amount of other funding requested	Dollar amount	Ratio[2]
23-28	RECOAMT	Total amount of other funding received	Dollar amount	Ratio[2]
29	GEOGAREA	Geographic area served	6=Nationwide 5=Region of nation (more one state) 4=State 3=Region within a state (more than one county) 2=County 1=Part of a county	Ordinal
30	JURISDIC	Jurisdiction of grantee	5=National 4=State 3=County 2=Local 1=Other	Nominal

1 Variables not used in stepwise multiple regression analysis.

2 Variables recoded. These recodes are outlined below.

3 These blocks of dummy coded variables were separated into individual variables and are outlined below.

Record #1

31-33	TOPMANNO	Number of top level personnel	Actual number	Interval
34-36	MIDMANNO	Number of middle management personnel	Actual number	Interval
37-39	FLSTAFNO	Number of front line staff	Actual number	Interval
40	ASSESS	Assessment is an objective	2=written objective 1=non-written objective 0=item not checked	Ordinal
41	PLACMENT	Placement is an objective	2=written objective 1=non-written objective 0=item not checked	Ordinal
42	TRAINED	Training and Education is an objective	2=written objective 1=non-written objective 0=item not checked	Ordinal
43	COUNSEL	Counseling is an objective	2=written objective 1=non-written objective 0=item not checked	Ordinal
44	PROGDEV	Program Development is an objective	2=written objective 1=non-written objective 0=item not checked	Ordinal
45	DISSREP	Dissemination and replication is an objective	2=written objective 1=non-written objective 0=item not checked	Ordinal
46	AGECORD	Agency Coordination is an objective	2=written objective 1=non-written objective 0=item not checked	Ordinal
47	MANPOWR	Manpower training is an objective	2=written objective 1=non-written objective 0=item not checked	Ordinal
48	RESEARCH	Research is an objective	2=written objective 1=non-written objective 0=item not checked	Ordinal
49	LOBBY	Lobbying is an objective	2=written objective 1=non-written objective 0=item not checked	Ordinal
50-52	PARTRAIN	Number of parents trained	Actual number	Ordinal

Record #1				
53-55	AGTRAIN	Number of agency personnel trained	Actual number	Ordinal
56-58	BUSTRAIN	Business/industry personnel trained	Actual number	Ordinal
59-61	TEATRAIN	Number of teachers trained	Actual number	Ordinal
62-64	PROTRAIN	Number of project personnel trained	Actual number	Ordinal
Record #2				
1-3	VOLTRAIN	Number of volunteers trained	Actual number	Ordinal
4-6	OTHTRAIN	Number of others trained	Actual number	Ordinal
7-9	STUDNO	Number of students served directly	Actual number	Ordinal
10-12	IMPACT	Number of students impacted	Actual number	Ordinal[1]
13-21	HANDICAP	Primary handicapping condition of target group	100000000=Autism/ Emotional disorder 010000000=Communication disorder/ Speech impairment 001000000=Hearing impairment/ Visual impairment 000100000=Learning disability 000010000=Severe Mental retardation 000001000=Moderate Mental retardation (TMR) 000000100=Mild Mental retardation (EMR) 000000010=Physical handicap 000000001=Other	Nominal[3]
22-25	AGE	Age range of clients	1000=> 25 years of age 0100=22-25 0010=18-21 0001=<18	Nominal
26	WHOEVAL	Personnel involved	1=only project personnel 2=external only 3=project plus external	Ordinal

Record #2

27	OFTEVAL	How often evaluations took place	1=at end of project 2=yearly 3=half-yearly 4=quarterly 5=monthly 6=< monthly 7=ongoing/daily	Ordinal
28	EXTEND	If there has been a no-cost extension	1=yes 2=no	Nominal$_2$
29-30	LENGTH	Length of extension	In months	Interval
31	DISEMLEV	Level of replication/ dissemination	4=Project has been replicated in whole or part by another organization 3=Dissemination seminars/ site visits held during project's operation 2=Dissemination seminars/ presentations held off project site 1=Dissemination conducted through publications and manuals only 0=No attempt at dissemination	Ordinal
32	CONTINUE	Level of continuation	6=Project being continued in situ and in full by means of other funding 5=<u>All</u> major components continued but split up and being continued by other agencies 4=>75% of project components continued (same as 6) 3=>50% of project components continued (same as 6) 2=>25% of project components continued (same as 6) 1=<25% of project components continued (same as 6) 0=No project components continued	Ordinal

Record #3

1-4	COMMUNTY	Types of community served	1000=Metropolitan area 0100=Suburb of metropolitan area 0010=Small town 0001=Rural area	Nominal
5-6	GRANTEE	Type of grantee	16=State agency 15=City or county gov. 14=Research inst. 13=Profit making agency 12=Non-profit making agency 11=Community education/ rehabilitation facility 10=Community workshop 09=Institution/hospital 08=JTPA Service Delivery 07=University or Four-Year College 06=Community Junior College 05=Local Education Agency 04=Private Secondary school 03=Public Secondary school 02=Citizens' Association 01=Other	Nominal
7-14	EDAGCYS	Education agencies involved	10000000=Community education/ rehabilitation facility 01000000=University or Four-Year College 00100000=Community Junior College 00010000=Local Education agency 00001000=Private Secondary school 00000100=Public Secondary school 00000010=Community workshop 00000001=Other	Nominal[3]

Record #3

15-23	OTHAGCYS	Other agencies involved	10000000=State agency 01000000=City or county gov. 00100000=Research inst. 00010000=Profit making agency/company 00001000=Non-profit making agency 00000100=Citizen's association 00000010=Institution/hospital 00000001=JTPA Service delivery 00000000=Other	Nominal$_3$
24-27	PURPOSE	Purpose of project	1000=Educational 0100=Employment 0010=Interagency cooperation 0001=Other	Nominal^3
28-34	METHOD	Method employed	1000000=Extend existing services 0100000=Standardize an existing process 0010000=Develop a new model of service 0001000=Build interagency partnerships 0000100=Implement a model program 0000010=Create a new agency 0000001=Other	Nominal$_1$
35-40	TMINVOL	Percentage involvement of top management	100000=100% 010000=>75%, <100% 001000=>50%, <75% 000100=>25%, <50% 000010=>10%, <25% 100000=<10%	Nominal^2
41-44	TMEDUCAT	Educational level of top management	1000=PhD 0100=MA 0010=College degree 0001=Other	Nominal$_2$

Record #3

45-50	MMINVOL	Percentage involvement of middle management	100000=100% 010000=>75%, <100% 001000=>50%, <75% 000100=>25%, <50% 000010=>10%, <25% 100000=<10%	Nominal[2]
51-54	MMEDUCAT	Educational level of middle management	1000=PhD 0100=MA 0010=College degree 0001=Other	Nominal[2]
55-60	FLSINVOL	Percentage involvement of front-line staff	100000=100% 010000=>75%, <100% 001000=>50%, <75% 000100=>25%, <50% 000010=>10%, <25% 100000=<10%	Nominal[2]
61-63	PERSCHA	If personnel changes have occurred	100=Top-level management 010=Middle management 001=Front-line staff 000=No changes	Nominal[2]

Record #4

1-4	PRODUCT	Types of products produced	1000=brochure/handbooks 0100=slides 0010=video 0001=journal articles 0000=no products (for combinations use code)	Nominal[1]
5-12	HOWEVAL	Type of Evaluation plan	10000000=System analysis 01000000=Goal based 00100000=Goal free 00010000=Decision making 00001000=Commisseurship 00000100=Professional review 00000010=Quasi legal 00000001=Case study (for combinations use code)	Nominal[1]

Record #4

13-18	TMTIMEVL	Overall amount of time spent on evaluation by top management	100000=100% 010000=>75%, <100% 001000=>50%, <75% 000100=>25%, <50% 000010=>10%, <25% 000001>10% 000000=None	Nominal[1]
19-24	MMTIMEVL	Overall amount of time spent on evaluation by middle management	100000=100% 010000=>75%, <100% 001000=>50%, <75% 000100=>25%, <50% 000010=>10%, <25% 000001>10% 000000=None	Nominal[1]
25-29	FLTIMEVL	Overall amount of time spent on evaluation by front-line staff	100000=100% 010000=>75%, <100% 001000=>50%, <75% 000100=>25%, <50% 000010=>10%, <25% 000001>10% 000000=None	Nominal[1]
31	EVALDOC	If an evaluation report exists	1=yes 2=no	Nominal[2]
32	AGCYPROB	Reported problems with other agencies	1=gaining initial support 2=maintaining support during funding period 3=other problems 0=no problems reported	Nominal[2]
33	CLIPROB	Reported problems with clients	1=too many clients 2=schools did not refer pupils 3=schools referred inappropriate pupils 4=follow-up difficult 5=other problems 0=no problems reported	Nominal[2]

Record #4

34	STAFPROB	Reported problems with staff	1="burnout" 2=high turnover 3=sudden resignations 4=other problems 0=no problems reported	Nominal[2]
35	EMPLPROB	Reported problems with employers	1=too few jobs 2=difficulty in placing clients 3=clients being laid off 4=other 0=no problems	Nominal[2]

RECODED VARIABLES

Original Name	New Name	Variable Description	Code	Level of Measurement
REQFEAMT:				
	REQFAMT1	Total amount of Federal funding requested	7=>$600001 6=>$500001 and <=$600000 5=>$400001 and <=$500000 4=>$300001 and <=$400000 3=>$200001 and <=$300000 2=>$100001 and <=$200000 1=>$000000 and <=$100000 0= No funding requested	Interval
FAMOUNT:				
	FEAMNT1	Total amount of Federal funding received	7=>$600001 6=>$500001 and <=$600000 5=>$400001 and <=$500000 4=>$300001 and <=$400000 3=>$200001 and <=$300000 2=>$100001 and <=$200000 1=>$000000 and <=$100000 0= No funding received	Interval
OAMTREQ:				
	OAMTEQ1	Total amount of other funding requested	7=>$600001 6=>$500001 and <=$600000 5=>$400001 and <=$500000 4=>$300001 and <=$400000 3=>$200001 and <=$300000 2=>$100001 and <=$200000 1=>$000000 and <=$100000 0= No funding requested	Interval
RECOAMT:				
	RECOAMT1	Total amount of other funding received	7=>$600001 6=>$500001 and <=$600000 5=>$400001 and <=$500000 4=>$300001 and <=$400000 3=>$200001 and <=$300000 2=>$100001 and <=$200000 1=>$000000 and <=$100000 0= No funding received	Interval
EXTEND				
	EXTEND	If there has been a no-cost extension	1=yes 0=no	Nominal

TMINVOL				
	TMINVOL	Greatest percentage involvement of any top level manager	6=100% 5=<100% and >=75% 4=<75% and >=50% 3=<50 and >25% 2=<25 and >=10% 1<10%	Ordinal
TMEDUCAT				
	TMEDUCAT	Highest level of education of any top level manager	3=PhD 2=MA 1=BA or other primary degree 0=No degree	Ordinal
MMINVOL				
	MMINVOL	Greatest percentage involvement of any middle manager	6=100% 5=<100% and >=75% 4=<75% and >=50% 3=<50 and >25% 2=<25 and >=10% 1<10%	Ordinal
MMEDUCAT				
	MMEDUCAT	Highest level of education of any middle manager	3=PhD 2=MA 1=BA or other primary degree 0=No degree	Ordinal
FLSINVOL				
	FLSINVOL	Greatest percentage involvement of of any front-line staff	6=100% 5=<100% and >=75% 4=<75% and >=50% 3=<50 and >25% 2=<25 and >=10% 1<10%	Ordinal
PERSCHA				
	PERSCHA	Highest level at which personnel changes have occurred	3=Top-level management 2=Middle management 1=Front-line staff 4=No changes	Ordinal
EVALDOC				
	EVALDOC	If an evaluation report exists	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
AGCYPROB				
	AGCYPROB	Reported problems with other agencies	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
CLIPROB				
	CLIPROB	Reported problems with clients	1=yes 0=no	Nominal

STAFPROB			
STAFPROB	Reported problems with staff	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
EMPLPROB			
EMPLPROB	Reported problems with employers	1=yes 0=no	Nominal

RECORD OF DUMMY CODED VARIABLES

Column Number	Variable Name	Variable Description	Code	Level of Measurement
Record #2				
13	AUTISM	Autism/Emotional disorder primary handicapping condition of target group	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
14	COMDMDIS	Communication disorder speech impairment primary handicapping condition of target group	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
15	HEARVIS	Hearing impairment/ visual impairment primary handicapping condition of target group	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
16	LD	Learning disability primary handicapping condition of target group	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
17	SMR	Severe mental retardation primary handicapping condition of target group	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
18	TMR	Trainable mental retardation primary handicapping condition of target group	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
19	EMR	Educable mental retardation primary handicapping condition of target group	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
20	PHYSICAL	Physical disability primary handicapping condition of target group	1=yes 0=no	Nominal

21	OTHER	Other primary handicapping condition of target group	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
22	OVR25	Client=>25 years age	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
23	FR22TO24	Client=>22 and <25 years of age	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
24	FR18TO21	Client=>18 and <22 years of age	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
25	LESS18	Client<18 years age	1=yes 0=no	Nominal

Record #3

1	METAREA	Metropolitan area served	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
2	SUBURB	Suburb of metropolitan area served	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
3	TOWN	Small town served	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
4	RURAL	Rural area served	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
7	EDCOMED	Community education/ rehabilitation facility involved in project	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
8	EDUNIV	University/four year college involved in project	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
9	EDCOLLEG	Community junior college involved in project	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
10	EDLOVED	Local Education agency involved in project	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
11	EDPRISCH	Private Secondary school involved in project	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
12	EDPUBSCH	Public Secondary school involved in project	1=yes 0=no	Nominal

13	EDCOMWRK	Community workshop involved in project	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
14	EDOTHER	Other educational facility involved project	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
15	OTSTATE	State agency other involved agency	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
16	OTCITY	City or county gov. other involved agency	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
17	OTRESE	Research inst. other involved agency	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
18	OTPROFIT	Profit making agency/company other involved agency	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
19	OTNOPROF	Non-profit making agency other involved agency	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
20	OTCITZN	Citizen's association other involved agency	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
21	OTINSHOS	Institution/hospital other involved agency	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
22	OTJTPA	JTPA Service delivery other involved agency	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
23	OTOTHER	Other involved agency	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
24	PURED	Purpose of project is educational	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
25	PUREMPL	Purpose of project is employment	1=yes 0=no	Nominal

26	PURCOOP	Purpose of project is interagency cooperation	1=yes 0=no	Nominal
27	PUROTHR	Purpose of project is other	1=yes 0=no	Nominal